Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, 1–6 (2014) Printed 30 June 2014 (MN LATEX style file v2.2)

Stochastic Star Formation & Feedback: Mapping Low-Mass Galaxies to Dark Matter Haloes

C. Power[1⋆], G. A. Wynn[2], A. Robotham[1], G. F. Lewis[3] & M. I. Wilkinson[2]
[1] *International Centre for Radio Astronomy Research, University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia*
[2] *Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 7RH, United Kingdom*
[3] *Sydney Institute for Astronomy, School of Physics, A28, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia*

arXiv:1406.7097v1 [astro-ph.GA] 27 Jun 2014

ABSTRACT
Comparison of observed satellite galaxies of the Milky Way (hereafter MW) with dark matter subhaloes in cosmological N-body simulations of MW-mass haloes suggest that such subhaloes, if they exist, are occupied by satellites in a stochastic fashion. We examine how inefficient massive star formation and associated supernova feedback in high-redshift progenitors of present-day low-mass subhaloes might contribute to this stochasticity. Using a Monte Carlo approach to follow the assembly histories of present-day low-mass haloes with $10^7 \lesssim M \leqslant 10^{10}$ M$_\odot$, we identify when cooling and star formation is likely to proceed, and observe that haloes with present-day masses $\lesssim 10^9$M$_\odot$ never grow sufficiently massive to support atomic hydrogen line cooling. Noting that the star formation timescale decreases sharply with stellar mass as $t_{\rm PMS} \propto m_*^{-2.5}$, we argue that, should the conditions for high mass star formation arise in low-mass haloes, the ensuing supernovae are likely to disrupt ongoing lower-mass star formation and unbind gas within the halo. This potentially star-forming gas is unlikely to be replenished in lower mass haloes because of, e.g. cosmological reionization, and so we expect galaxy formation to be stymied in a manner that depends on host halo assembly history and the efficiency and timing of star formation in proto-galaxies, which we illustrate using a Monte Carlo model. Based on these simple physical arguments, we assert that stochasticity of star formation and feedback is an essential but overlooked ingredient in modelling galaxy formation on the smallest scales.

Key words: galaxies: formation – galaxies: evolution – stars: formation – methods: analytical – methods: numerical

1 INTRODUCTION

A defining prediction of the Cold Dark Matter (hereafter CDM) model of structure formation is that dark matter haloes contain a wealth of substructure (hereafter subhaloes) whose abundance increases with decreasing mass M, approximately as $M^{-0.8}$ (e.g. Springel et al. 2008). The connection between this subhalo population and the hosts of galaxies in galaxy clusters has been appreciated for some time (e.g. White et al. 1987; Frenk et al. 1988), but it required the emergence of cosmological N-body simulations with sufficiently high mass and force resolution to overcome overmerging (cf. Moore, Katz, & Lake 1996; Klypin et al. 1999a) to establish that the presence of substructure in dark matter haloes is a presistent feature of the CDM model. It was soon appreciated that this signals a problem on the scale of galaxies. If subhaloes in cluster-mass systems are the hosts of cluster galaxies, then subhaloes in galaxy-mass systems should host satellite galaxies and we should expect many more satellites around galaxies like the Milky Way and Andromeda than are observed – the so-called "Missing Satellites" problem (e.g. Klypin et al. 1999b; Moore et al. 1999).

This apparent tension between simulation and observation has led to over a decade of investigation in which both astrophysical (e.g. feedback from supernovae, cf. Dekel & Silk 1986, or from a photo-ionizing background during cosmological reionization, cf. Efstathiou 1992) and particle physics (e.g. revision of the dark matter model) explanations for the apparent dearth of satellite galaxies around Milky Way-type galaxies have been explored. The challenge remains to construct a physically-motivated predictive theory to map the subhalo population identified in cosmological N-body simulations to a plausible realisation of the observed satellite galaxy population of the Milky Way. Despite this, empirically matching the abundance of observed satellites with subhaloes identified in cosmological N-boy simulations has led to the conclusion that satellite galaxies occupy their dark matter (sub)haloes in a stochastic fashion; that is, a simple linear mapping of satellite galaxy to dark matter host based on, for example, subhalo mass, cannot reproduce the observed abundance and spatial distribution of satellite galaxies (cf. Boylan-Kolchin, Bullock, & Kaplinghat 2011). The question remains as to what drives this stochasticity?

⋆ chris.power@icrar.org

© 2014 RAS

The environmental dependence of cosmological reionization offers one possibility. Low-mass haloes that formed sufficiently early, prior to reionization, could have formed stars, and it is likely that these correspond to the satellites that we see today (e.g. Moore et al. 2006). For example, the number density of dwarf galaxies in galaxy clusters is much higher than in the field, reflecting the biased nature of galaxy formation – dwarf galaxies in overdense regions would have formed earlier and in greater numbers than their counterparts in mean- or low-density regions. Reionization would have had the effect of spatially filtering the abundance of satellite galaxies – that is, more dwarfs would have formed in overdense regions than in mean- or low-density regions (e.g. Weinmann et al. 2007). However, the spatial scales over which this filtering would have occurred suggests that this form of suppression cannot be considered stochastic.

The stochasticity of star formation and consequent feedback in low-mass haloes offers another possibility. Recent observational evidence (e.g. Skillman et al. 2014; Weisz et al. 2014) and theoretical considerations (e.g. Madau et al. 2014; Kelson 2014) suggests that star formation is likely to have proceeded in a stochastic fashion in low-mass systems. We are particularly interested in the consequences of stochasticity in the rate at which high mass stars form and the resulting feedback (e.g. photo-ionization, stellar winds, supernovae); in this short paper, we focus on the impact of supernovae in these systems. Simple physical arguments, which we set out in §2, suggest that star formation should be inefficient in low-mass haloes and that scaling relations such as Schmidt-Kennicutt are likely to break down at low masses. This implies that the likelihood of stars massive enough to result in supernovae ($M \gtrsim 8\mathrm{M}_\odot$) is low. However, when they do form, they form rapidly – the pre-Main Sequence timescale ($t_{\rm PMS}$) declines sharply with increasing stellar mass as $t_{\rm PMS} \propto m_*^{-2.5}$ (cf. Kippenhahn et al. 2013), and so high mass stars may reach the Main Sequence and evolve along it to yield supernovae on a timescale that is shorter than that required for lower-mass stars ($\sim \mathrm{M}_\odot$) to form. The injection of $\sim 10^{51}$ erg of mechanical energy per supernovae into the IGM can potentially unbind the gas in the galaxy, which occurs on mass scales of order $10^7 - 10^8\mathrm{M}_\odot$ for single massive stars. We investigate this picture using Monte Carlo halo mass assembly histories and star formation models (cf. §3) and discuss how it can help to explain the low observed occupancy rate of low-mass dark matter subhaloes with satellites, which we summarise in §4.

2 STOCHASTIC STAR FORMATION & FEEDBACK IN LOW-MASS HALOES: ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

We consider a dark matter halo, which we treat as a spherically overdense region of virial mass $M_{\rm vir}$,

$$M_{\rm vir} = \frac{4\pi}{3}\,\Delta_{\rm vir}\,\rho_{\rm crit}\,r_{\rm vir}^3 \tag{1}$$

where $\Delta_{\rm vir}$ is the virial overdensity criterion, $\rho_{\rm crit} = 3H^2/8\pi G$ is the critical density of the Universe at redshift z, H is the Hubble parameter and G the gravitational constant, and $r_{\rm vir}$ is the corresponding virial radius. The corresponding virial velocity is

$$V_{\rm vir}^2 = \frac{GM_{\rm vir}}{r_{\rm vir}} = (GH)^{2/3}\left(\frac{\Delta_{\rm vir}}{2}\right)^{1/3} M_{\rm vir}^{2/3}, \tag{2}$$

which can be written more compactly as

$$V_{\rm vir} \simeq 35\left(\frac{\Delta_{\rm vir}}{200}\right)^{1/6}\left(\frac{M_{\rm vir}}{10^{10}h^{-1}\mathrm{M}_\odot}\right)^{1/3} f(z)^{1/2}\mathrm{km/s}, \tag{3}$$

where

$$f(z) = \Omega_M(1+z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda \tag{4}$$

takes into account evolution where redshift z, and Ω_M and Ω_Λ are the matter and dark energy density parameters respectively. We assume that the halo contains a reservoir of hot gas whose mass is approximately $M_{\rm gas} \sim f_b M_{\rm vir}$, where $f_{\rm b} = \Omega_{\rm b}/\Omega_{\rm M}$ is the cosmic mean baryon fraction and $\Omega_{\rm b}$ is the baryon density parameter. This is an upper limit – Crain et al. (2007) found that the baryon fraction within $r_{\rm vir}$ is approximately 90 per cent of the cosmic mean, independent of $M_{\rm vir}$ and z, in cosmological non-radiative hydrodynamical simulations, while galaxy formation simulations that account explicitly for the presence of a background radiation at high redshifts suggest baryon fractions closer to 10 per cent (cf. Figure 3 Milosavljević & Bromm 2014, and references therein). We use the virial temperature $T_{\rm vir}$ of the halo,

$$T_{\rm vir} = \frac{\mu\, m_p}{2k} V_{\rm vir}^2, \tag{5}$$

which we approximate as

$$T_{\rm vir} \simeq 4.4\times10^4\left(\frac{\Delta_{\rm vir}}{200}\right)^{1/3}\left(\frac{M_{\rm vir}}{10^{10}h^{-1}\mathrm{M}_\odot}\right)^{2/3} f(z)\,\mathrm{K}. \tag{6}$$

From this we compute the threshold halo mass equivalent to the $T_{\rm vir}$ required for efficient cooling, the prerequisite for star formation to occur. We consider two values : $T_{\rm vir} \simeq 10^3$ K and $\simeq 10^4$ K. For haloes with $T_{\rm vir} \sim 10^4$ K and below, primordial gas can cool efficiently through collisional excitation of atomic hydrogen (see, for example, Moore et al. 2006). However, molecular hydrogen can also act as an efficient coolant in haloes with $T_{\rm vir} \gtrsim 10^3$ K, and it's likely that this was the dominant cooling mechanism in the earliest generations of star forming haloes (e.g. Glover 2005).

As gas cools into the centre of the halo, we might expect it to form a disc-like structure at the centre of the potential – assuming the system to be dynamically relaxed – whose radial extent is governed by the initial angular momentum of the gas (cf. Fall & Efstathiou 1980; Mo et al. 1998) and vertical extent is set by its temperature. If the gas within the disc is in hydrostatic equilibrium, the condition for a thin disc to form is that the circular velocity $V_{\rm circ}$ is much greater than the sound speed of the gas,

$$c_{\rm snd} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{kT}{m_{\rm p}}}, \tag{7}$$

where T is the temperature of the gas, k is the Boltzmann constant and $m_{\rm p}$ is the proton mass. Gas temperatures of $10^4/10^3/10^2$K correspond to sound speeds of $\sim$ 10/3/1 km/s. In these cases, $c_{\rm snd}/V_{\rm circ} \sim 1$ implies halo masses ranging from $\sim 3.5\times10^8\mathrm{M}_\odot$ for 10 km/s to $10^7\mathrm{M}_\odot$ for 3 km/s to $\sim 3.5\times10^5\mathrm{M}_\odot$ for 1 km/s. In this limit discs are likely to be diffuse, vertically extended structures with low surface densities, and so we reason that star formation is likely to be inefficient. We note that a similar conclusion has been reached by Milosavljević & Bromm (2014), who investigated the structure and stability of gas discs in dwarf spheroidal progenitors (see their § 4.2).

The maximum rate at which gas accumulates in the disc to form stars will be dynamical,

$$\dot{M} = f_g\frac{M_{\rm vir}}{t_{\rm dyn}} \simeq 0.1\sqrt{\frac{2}{\Delta_{\rm vir}}}\left(\frac{f_g}{0.1}\right)\left(\frac{M_{\rm vir}}{10^{10}\mathrm{M}_\odot}\right)\mathrm{M}_\odot/\mathrm{yr}, \tag{8}$$

which implies that at most $1.5\times10^6\mathrm{M}_\odot$ of gas could settle in the inner parts of a $1.5\times10^8\mathrm{M}_\odot$ halo over 100 Myrs. If the star formation efficiency was 100 percent, then we would expect 0.2

per cent ($\sim$ 2000, assuming a Salpeter (1955) IMF) of the stars that form to have masses in excess of 8 $\mathrm{M}_\odot$, the threshold mass for the star to go supernova. However, we expect star formation efficiencies much lower than this.

Interestingly, the timescale for star formation can be an appreciable fraction of the age of the Universe at high redshifts. Stars form from cold dense clouds of gas, which must collapse sufficiently before a star can reach the zero age Main Sequence (ZAMS), and the timescale for this to occur is much longer for low-mass stars than their high mass counterparts. The pre-main sequence lifetime (i.e. the timescale to reach ZAMS) of a star of mass m_* can be approximated as

$$t_{\rm PMS} \simeq 10^7 \left(\frac{m_*}{\mathrm{M}_\odot}\right)^{-2.5} \mathrm{yr} \qquad (9)$$

and so massive stars reach ZAMS much earlier than lower mass stars (cf. Kippenhahn et al. 2013) . A 1 $\mathrm{M}_\odot$ star reaches ZAMS after 10^7yr, whereas an 8 $\mathrm{M}_\odot$ reaches ZAMS after $\sim 5.5 \times 10^4$ yr, which implies that high mass stars can reach ZAMS and evolve off the MS as supernovae, each depositing 10^{51} erg of energy into their surroundings, before lower mass stars have had time to form. For example, a 20 $\mathrm{M}_\odot$ star will have had sufficient time to reach ZAMS and evolve off the Main Sequence ($t_{\rm MS} \sim 10^7$ yr) before a 1 $\mathrm{M}_\odot$ star has reached ZAMS.

Finally, we compare the amount of energy liberated by supernovae and deposited into the surrounding gas to the binding energy of gas in a dark matter halo. For a NFW profile, the binding energy is

$$W = W_0 \times \left[\frac{c}{1+c} - \frac{\log(1+c)}{(1+c)}\right] \qquad (10)$$

where $c = r_{\rm vir}/r_s$ is the halo's concentration with r_s the scale radius, and

$$W_0 = -\frac{16\pi^2}{2} f_b G \rho_{\rm crit}^2 \left(\frac{\Delta_{\rm vir}}{3}\frac{c^3}{\log(1+c)-c/(1+c)}\right)^2 \left(\frac{r_{\rm vir}}{c}\right)^5. \qquad (11)$$

We can simplify this to get

$$W \simeq 10^{56} \left(\frac{M_{\rm vir}}{10^{10}\mathrm{M}_\odot/h}\right)^{5/3} \left(\frac{f_b}{0.16}\right) \mathcal{F}(c)\mathrm{erg} \qquad (12)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}(c) = c \times \frac{[c/(1+c) - \log(1+c)/(1+c)]}{[\log(1+c) - c/(1+c)]^2}; \qquad (13)$$

for reasonable values of c, $\mathcal{F}(c) \sim 3-4$. For a $10^7\mathrm{M}_\odot$ halo, the binding energy of gas is of order the mechanical energy of a supernova. We have argued that the gaseous discs in these mass systems are likely to be diffuse and extended vertically, and so it is likely to be relatively easily disrupted by the impact of supernovae (and preceeding photo-ionization and stellar winds by their Main Sequence progenitors).

3 STAR FORMATION IN LOW-MASS HALOES: MONTE CARLO MODELLING

3.1 Assembly Histories

We have used the algorithm of Parkinson et al. (2008) to generate Monte Carlo merger histories – so called trees – for dark matter haloes with masses between $M_{\rm vir}$=$10^7\mathrm{M}_\odot$ to $10^{10}\mathrm{M}_\odot$ at z=0, in the range we would expect to bracket the virial masses of the hosts of present day satellite galaxies. These merger trees track the evolution of the haloes identified with mass M at z=0 to an initial redshift of z=30, which we capture at uniform intervals in the logarithm of the expansion factor, $a = 1/(1+z)$. Because this particular implementation has been calibrated against N-body trees drawn the Millennium simulation, we can rapidly explore a range of realistic merger histories for a statistical sample of haloes. For this reason, we adopt the cosmological parameters used for the Millennium Simulation (Ω_0=0.25, Ω_0=0.75, h=0.73 and σ_8=0.9) when constructing these trees, rather than the more recent Planck parameters (cf. Ade et al. 2013); the differences will be quantitative rather than qualitative, driven by the change in σ_8, and will not affect the logic of our argument.

We begin by using the trees to explore the factors by which haloes of present day virial mass M have grown since a fixed redshift in the early Universe. For each halo mass we sample 5000 trees and for each halo tree we determine progenitor masses at z=6 and z=10. Median and upper lower quartiles of the ratio $M(z)/M(z=0)$ are summarised in Table 1, while the distributions of these values for halo growth since z=6 are shown in Figures 1 for present-day halo masses of 5×10^7, 10^8, 10^9 and $10^{10}\mathrm{M}_\odot$. As a general rule, the more massive the halo, the more rapidly it has grown since high redshift – e.g. a $5 \times 10^7\mathrm{M}_\odot$ ($10^{10}\mathrm{M}_\odot$) halo at z=0 has grown by a median factor of ~ 5 (~ 10) since z=6 and ~ 17 (~ 62) since z=10 – but also the narrow the distribution of $M(z)/M(z=0)$, the factor by which it has grown in mass between z and z=0.

3.2 Epoch of Initial Star Formation

For each halo we determine $z_{\rm cool}$, the redshift at which a progenitor halo becomes sufficiently massive to support cooling and consequently star formation. In Figure 2 we show the distribution of $z_{\rm cool}$ for haloes with present day masses between $10^7\mathrm{M}_\odot$ and $10^{10}\mathrm{M}_\odot$ first exceed a virial temperature of 10^3K, the threshold for cooling via molecular hydrogen; haloes less massive than $\sim 10^9$K never become sufficiently massive to support cooling via atomic hydrogen. The key point to note in this Figure is that more massive haloes can support cooling earlier in their assembly histories. However, this assumes that haloes form in regions of mean cosmic density. We can mimic the effect of haloes forming in overdense environments – which is likely for lower mass haloes – by increasing the value of σ_8 (e.g. Boley et al. 2009), which shifts $z_{\rm cool}$ to high redshifts. For example, increasing σ_8 from 0.8 to 1.0 increases $z_{\rm cool}$ from ~ 15.5 to ~ 21.3, a difference of $\approx 10^8$ years in our adopted cosmology.

For each of these haloes, we mimic the effect of inefficient star formation by assuming that only a fraction f_* of the gas content of the halo at $z_{\rm cool}$ can cool and form stars. We consider cases in which (i) f_* is the same for all haloes and (ii) f_* is drawn from a Gaussian distribution, with a mean and standard deviation that we are free to choose; f_* encapsulates our ignornance about the physics that drives star formation and so acts as a formation effi-

ciency. From this star-forming gas mass,

$$M_* = f_* f_{\rm b} M_{\rm vir}(z_{\rm cool}), \quad (14)$$

we sample an initial mass function $\xi(m)$ to obtain the distribution of stellar masses and count the number of stars with masses in excess of 8 $M_\odot$. Here we use the Salpeter (1955) IMF (i.e. $N(m) \propto m^{-1.35}$), but we have verified that the choice of IMF does not influence our results by using also the Kroupa (2001) and Chabrier (2001) IMFs. Note that the larger the value we choose for f_*, the greater the number of massive stars that form and the larger the energy they can deposit into the interstellar and circumgalactic medium (ISM and CGM respectively). We consider values of f_* that vary between 10^{-6} and 10^{-3}; the effect is linear in f_*, as we would expect, and so we are more interested in relative rather than absolute values versus M and $z_{\rm cool}$.

The fate of gas in these nascent galaxies is governed by the high mass stars that form, each depositing $\sim 10^{51}$ ergs into the ISM and CGM, which can unbind gas in the halo and possibly prevent further stars from forming. We compute the ratio of supernovae-deposited energy to the binding energy of the proto-galaxy as soon as the first massive stars have had sufficient time to form and evolve off the main sequence ($\Delta t \sim t_{\rm PMS} + t_{\rm MS}$; cf. Eq 9) subsequent to the halo becoming sufficiently massive to support cooling. In Figure 3 we plot the ratio $f_{\rm bind} = E_{\rm SNe}/E_{\rm bind}$ against halo mass at $z_{\rm cool}$, where we compute $f_{\rm bind}$ from energy deposited by supernovae whose progenitor initial masses were in excess of 8 $M_\odot$ and, recall, we identify $z_{\rm cool}$ as the redshift at which the virial temperature of the halo first exceeds 10^3K.

As we would expect, Figure 3 shows that supernovae are most destructive in the haloes that have the lowest masses – and therefore the shallowest potentials – at $z_{\rm cool}$, depositing sufficient energy to unbind the gas in the halo. However, inspecting the key, which shows how the points are colour-coded in accord with their $z_{\rm cool}$, is instructive; these low-mass systems are more likely to be the high redshift progenitors of present-day higher mass haloes ($M \gtrsim 10^9 M_\odot$). These haloes will continue to grow and they can potentially reaccrete gas and support atomic line cooling once their virial temperatures exceed 10^4K; depending on their final mass, this bursty mode of star formation may be traceable in the chemistry of their stars and accessible to observations (e.g. Kirby et al. 2013) . In contrast, the progenitors of present-day low-mass haloes are more likely to reach the threshold for forming their stars later (i.e. lower $z_{\rm cool}$) when they are more massive and so supernovae will less effective, a point that is made clear in Figure 4. However, the late onset of cooling in these systems means that it is more likely that the ambient radiation field in which these systems reside will reionize the gas that would otherwise collapse and cool in these haloes. For this reason, the effects of stochastic star formation and feedback are likely to be most pronounced in haloes with present-day masses of $\sim 10^9 - 10^{10} M_\odot$.

4 SUMMARY

Using simple physical arguments, we explored star formation and associated feedback in low-mass dark matter haloes. We reasoned that star formation should proceed in an inefficient fashion in these systems and consequently that the formation rate of high mass stars

Table 1. Satellite Halo Assembly Histories. $M(z{=}0)$ corresponds to the satellite halo mass at z=0; $\mathcal{M}_{z=6}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{z=10}$ correspond to the median value of the ratio of the z=6 and 10 progenitor masses to the z=0 mass, with associated upper and lower quartiles; and $z_{\rm cool}$ represents the median redshift, with upper and lower quartiles, at which the z=0 halo's progenitors were sufficiently massive to support cooling by molecular ($T_{\rm vir} = 10^3$K, first value) and atomic ($T_{\rm vir} = 10^4$K, second value) hydrogen respectively.

M [$h^{-1}M_\odot$]	$\mathcal{M}_{z=6}$	$\mathcal{M}_{z=10}$	$z_{\rm cool}$
5×10^7	$0.18^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$	$0.058^{+0.028}_{-0.021}$	$12.8^{+2.8}_{-2.4}$ / -
10^8	$0.15^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$0.041^{+0.021}_{-0.015}$	$15.5^{+2.4}_{-2.6}$ / -
10^9	$0.11^{+0.05}_{-0.03}$	$0.027^{+0.015}_{-0.011}$	$22.3^{+2.8}_{-2.8}$ / $8.2^{+2.0}_{-2.4}$
10^{10}	$0.08^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.016^{+0.009}_{-0.006}$	$27.7^{+2.8}_{-3.0}$ / $14.6^{+2.4}_{-2.0}$



Figure 1. Satellite Halo Growth since z=6. We plot the unnormalised probability distributions of $\mathcal{M}_{z=6} = M(z=6)/M(z=0)$ for haloes with z=0 masses of $10^7 M_\odot$, $10^8 M_\odot$, $10^9 M_\odot$ and $10^{10} M_\odot$ (red, green, blue and purple filled regions respectively).

($m_* \geqslant 8 M_\odot$) and resulting supernovae[1] is likely to be stochastic. Because the star formation timescale decreases sharply with increasing stellar mass, as $t_{\rm PMS} \propto m_*^{-2.5}$, we argued that high mass stars that form early can both disrupt subsequent lower mass star formation and drive gas, which would otherwise be available for star formation, out of low-mass haloes.

Using Monte Carlo assembly histories of low mass haloes with present-day masses $10^7 M_\odot \lesssim M \leqslant 10^{10} M_\odot$, we estimated when a given halo mass was likely to have first supported cooling and star formation by determining the redshift at which the progenitor virial temperature first exceeded thresholds of 10^3K (for molecular hydrogen cooling) and 10^4K (for atomic hydrogen cooling). Haloes with present-day masses $\lesssim 10^9 M_\odot$ tend to reach the

[1] Although we focus on supernovae, this applies equally to other forms of feedback by Main Sequence progenitors, namely photo-ionization and stellar winds.



Figure 2. Redshift at which Cooling is Supported. Here we plot the unnormalised probability distributions of $z_{\rm cool}$ for haloes with z=0 masses of $10^9 {\rm M}_\odot$ and $10^{10} {\rm M}_\odot$ (blue and red filled regions respectively).



Figure 3. Fraction of Binding Energy Deposited by Supernovae as a function of halo mass at $z_{\rm cool}$. Points are coloured by $z_{\rm cool}$, as indiciated by the colour bar.

threshold for cooling via molecular hydrogen later. If they reach the threshold prior to the onset of cosmological reionization and form high mass stars, their potential wells are sufficiently shallow that gas can be expelled by supernovae, they never become massive enough to re-accrete gas that cools, and the expelled gas is likely to be further heated by cosmological reionization; otherwise, if they don't reach the threshold prior to reionization, gas can never cool and star formation cannot proceed. The epoch of star



Figure 4. Fraction of Binding Energy Deposited by Supernovae as a function of $z_{\rm cool}$, for haloes with present-day masses between 5×10^7 and 10^{10} ${\rm M}_\odot$. Points are coloured by the present-day halo mass, as indiciated by the colour bar. Vertical dotted line indicates the redshift at which we expect reionization to be complete, which we use as a natural boundary for this process to be viable.

formation in these systems is likely to be concentrated in a single burst, and may explain observations such as those of Brown et al. (2012), who examined the star formation histories of ultra-faint dwarf galaxies, the least luminous and most dark matter dominated systems known, and found no evidence for extended star formation histories. In contrast, haloes with present-day masses $\sim 10^9$ to $10^{10} {\rm M}_\odot$ reach the threshold for cooling via molecular hydrogen cooling early ($z \gtrsim 20$) and, while supernovae may disrupt star formation and expel gas, the halo grows sufficiently to reach the threshold for atomic hydrogen cooling and there is time for gas to be re-accreted. These systems are likely to experience episodic star formation, which may be inferred from the chemistry of their stellar populations.

In this way, inefficient star formation in low-mass haloes and the disparity in timescales for the formation and of low- and high-mass stars, with their associated feedback, conspires to produce an internal mechanism for quenching galaxy formation in low-mass haloes in a stochastic fashion. This will act in conjunction with external mechanisms, such as the ionizing radiation background that was present during cosmological reionization (e.g. Weinmann et al. 2007; Lunnan et al. 2012) . This is in accord with the adaptive mesh refinement cosmological zoom simulation of Simpson et al. (2013), who studied the formation and evolution of a galaxy in a $10^9 {\rm M}_\odot$ dark matter halo at high redshift. They found that cosmological reionization is responsible for expelling most of the low density gas from the halo, while supernovae are required to disperse the cool, high density gas from the disc.

We have presented a general argument, but we note that it provides a plausible explanation for the implied low and apparently stochastic rate of occupancy of satellite galaxies in dark matter haloes with masses $M \lesssim 10^{10} {\rm M}_\odot$, which appears to be required to reconcile observations of satellite galaxies around the Milky Way

with dark matter subhaloes in MW-type systems in cosmological N-body simulations (cf. Boylan-Kolchin, Bullock, & Kaplinghat 2011).

We have focussed on the effects of high mass star formation and supernovae, but we note also that stars more massive than 2.5 $\mathrm{M}_{\odot}$ form in multiplets, and can evolve to form X-ray binaries. These can be extremely luminous, both radiatively and mechanically, and unbind gas in the galaxy (e.g. Justham & Schawinski 2012; Power et al. 2013). At the same time, their formation depends on details of the formation of stellar multiplets and binary evolution, factors that are for all intents and purposes stochastic.

Finally we note that this process should not depend on the underlying dark matter model – the nature of the physical processes (e.g. cooling, star formation, feedback) will not and so galaxy formation in low-mass haloes will be subject to the same physically-imposed limitations across dark matter models (see discussion in, for example, Power 2013).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CP thanks the GALFORM Team for making the merger tree algorithm of Parkinson et al. (2008) publically available. CP and GFL acknowledge support of Australian Research Council (ARC) DP130100117; CP, ASGR, and GFL acknowledge support of ARC DP140100198. CP acknowledges support of ARC FT130100041. The research presented in this paper is undertaken as part of the Survey Simulation Pipeline (SSimPL; `http://ssimpl.org/`).

REFERENCES

Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., et al. 2013, arXiv:1303.5076
Boley, A. C., Lake, G., Read, J., & Teyssier, R. 2009, ApJ, 706, L192
Boylan-Kolchin M., Bullock J. S., Kaplinghat M., 2011, MNRAS, 415, L40
Brown, T. M., Tumlinson, J., Geha, M., et al. 2012, ApJ, 753, L21
Chabrier G., 2001, ApJ, 554, 1274
Crain, R. A., Eke, V. R., Frenk, C. S., et al. 2007, MNRAS, 377, 41
Dekel, A., & Silk, J. 1986, ApJ, 303, 39
Efstathiou, G. 1992, MNRAS, 256, 43P
Fall, S. M., & Efstathiou, G. 1980, MNRAS, 193, 189
Frenk C. S., White S. D. M., Davis M., Efstathiou G., 1988, ApJ, 327, 507
Gao L., Frenk C. S., Boylan-Kolchin M., Jenkins A., Springel V., White S. D. M., 2011, MNRAS, 410, 2309
Glover, S. 2005, Space Science Reviews, 117, 445
Ishiyama T., et al., 2013, ApJ, 767, 146
Justham, S., & Schawinski, K. 2012, MNRAS, 423, 1641
Kelson, D. D. 2014, arXiv:1406.5191
Kippenhahn, R., Weigert, A., & Weiss, A. 2013, Stellar Structure and Evolution, Astronomy and Astrophysics Library. ISBN 978-3-642-30255-8. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg
Kirby, E. N., Cohen, J. G., Guhathakurta, P., et al. 2013, ApJ, 779, 102
Klypin A., Gottlöber S., Kravtsov A. V., Khokhlov A. M., 1999a, ApJ, 516, 530
Klypin A., Kravtsov A. V., Valenzuela O., Prada F., 1999b, ApJ, 522, 82
Kroupa P., 2001, MNRAS, 322, 231
Lunnan R., Vogelsberger M., Frebel A., Hernquist L., Lidz A., Boylan-Kolchin M., 2012, ApJ, 746, 109
Madau, P., Weisz, D. R., & Conroy, C. 2014, arXiv:1406.0838
Milosavljević, M., & Bromm, V. 2014, MNRAS, 440, 50
Mo, H. J., Mao, S., & White, S. D. M. 1998, MNRAS, 295, 319
Moore B., Katz N., Lake G., 1996, ApJ, 457, 455
Moore B., Ghigna S., Governato F., Lake G., Quinn T., Stadel J., Tozzi P., 1999, ApJ, 524, L19
Moore, B., Diemand, J., Madau, P., Zemp, M., & Stadel, J. 2006, MNRAS, 368, 563
Parkinson, H., Cole, S., & Helly, J. 2008, MNRAS, 383, 557
Power, C. 2013, PASA, 30, 53
Power, C., James, G., Combet, C., & Wynn, G. 2013, ApJ, 764, 76
Salpeter E. E., 1955, ApJ, 121, 161
Simpson, C. M., Bryan, G. L., Johnston, K. V., et al. 2013, MNRAS, 432, 1989
Skillman, E. D., Hidalgo, S. L., Weisz, D. R., et al. 2014, ApJ, 786, 44
Springel, V., Wang, J., Vogelsberger, M., Ludlow, A., Jenkins, A., Helmi, A., Navarro, J. F., Frenk, C. S., & White, S. D. M. 2008, MNRAS, 391, 1685
Weinmann, S. M., Macciò, A. V., Iliev, I. T., Mellema, G., & Moore, B. 2007, MNRAS, 381, 367
Weisz, D. R., Dolphin, A. E., Skillman, E. D., et al. 2014, arXiv:1404.7144
White S. D. M., Davis M., Efstathiou G., Frenk C. S., 1987, Natur, 330, 451